

Date: Thu, 17 Feb 94 04:30:29 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #68
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 17 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 68

Today's Topics:

Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS
 Date on 610 form
 Exams are Trivial?
 GMRS
 Olympics

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 16 Feb 1994 18:00:00 -0600
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!
swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2jtrso\$nmv@vixen.cso.uiuc.edu>,
...green spleen... <trd54583@uxa.cso.uiuc.edu> wrote:
>xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:
>
>>Out of the last 80 posts, 33 were authored by Dan Pickersgill.
>
>>Who's that who was whining again?
>
>Jesus...talk about non-sequiturs. So the man posted 33/80 posts. Where is it
>implied that posting equals whining??

Perhaps you should READ his posts.

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: Sun, 13 Feb 94 09:48:00 -0400
From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!pplace!pat.wilson@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Date on 610 form
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-> Message-ID: <jay.761119548@coyote>
-> Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
-> Organization: Regional Access Information Network
->
-> I recently submitted my license renewal to FCC on a 610 form dated
-> 1991. Today I got a letter in the mail from "The W5YI Group, Inc."
-> with a November 1993 610 form and a note stating that previous
-> editions of the form will not be accepted.
->
-> The letter also indicated that I should send the completed form to
-> The W5YI Group along with a \$5 "processing fee" rather than to the
-> FCC.
-> As it is intuitively obvious that The W5YI Group, Inc. will merely
-> open all such renewal requests, remove the money, and remail them to
-> the FCC, it makes little sense to send the form (or the money) to
-> W5YI, Inc.

If you sent it to the FCC directly, they are not accepting the old forms past a certain date. I believe that date is as of FEB 28. If you however sent it thru the W5YI group, then their end date is somewhat earlier. You can AND SHOULD send it directly to the FCC on the NEW FORM and forget the W5YI crap. As long as you have the correct 610 (the simplified version), you have no problem.

->
-> Should I send another request to FCC using the new 610 that W5YI so
-> thoughtfully provided? If so, how do I answer question 7, "If you
-> have filed another Form 610 that we have not acted upon, purpose of
-> other form and date filed?"

I would not send another. You have a two year grace period of act and not only that, it is my understand, that the FCC is acting on the old ones until FEB 28th, you have no problem. This information is coming

from a VE who has read the information from the ARRL concerning the dates. We have a supply available of the new 610's but do not be concerned, as long as yours is acted on before the 28th.

-> My license is due to expire 2/17/94.

And now, please tell me why you waited so close to your final date?

-> de WB6RDV

->

-> --

de N0RDQ

Date: Wed, 16 Feb 94 22:41:00 -0400

From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!pplace!chris.myers@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Exams are Trivial?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hold on a minute. Why are the no codes being bashed in the first place? Aren't we all "Amateur Radio Operators?" At least that was I heard. What difference does it make whether someone DX's to the far side of the globe or just talks to a friend 20 miles away through a repeater? I like a lot of no-coders would eventually like to advance in their levels but for right now, being in college and not having too much spare time anyway, I am happy just to be able to hit a repeater 100 land miles from my home. Why bother no-coders, they have as much right to their specific frequencys as any other license classes have to theirs. This is not a direct result of what I have read here but a result of many discussions I have heard other places putting down tech's. We are all part of the same organization whether some of you wish to admit it or not and it's about time we started bashing tech's. We should be setting an example for the non hams out there. We should be the last to pick at such petty things. We alone have such a unique opportunity to share ideas. The world says everyone would like peace. Peace and harmony do not come out of such nitpicking as to whether you're as good as another ham just because you didn't take the code to get your ticket! Any further problems with the Technician class licenses should be take up with the FCC because as far as they are concerned, WE ARE Hams!

John (Chris) Myers
KE4IBD

Technician Class Operator and Proud of It!!!!!!!!!!!!

Date: 15 Feb 1994 18:31:43 GMT
From: korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!pongo!myers@ames.arpa
Subject: GMRS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <woVqHc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>

>> Also, if you really need repeater-style (UHF) local area coverage,
>> you can also choose GMRS. You don't have to take a test
>> and you pay a small (yearly?) license fee. The equipment IS
>> expensive (setting up your own repeater) but, like in amateur
>> radio, you get what you pay for. Also, you do NOT absolutely
>> need a repeater to get started in GMRS, the GMRS handi-talkies
>> work just fine for point-to-point UHF.

>

>However GMRS (The old Class A CB) is currently overwhelmed by business
>communications. Around here repeater time is running \$30/month and up.
>And all the repeater pairs are taken. In fact the .675 pair has 3
>repeaters in this area.

Hey, there's at least three GMRS repeaters here in a choice high-level location that have maybe five users between them.

"Here" is the Antelope Valley, Palmdale/Lancaster, CA.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 16 Feb 1994 04:45:19 GMT
From: ucsnews!newshub.sdsu.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!crcnis1.unl.edu!
unlinfo.unl.edu!mcduffie@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Olympics

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>Who is she talking to?

>Jeff NH6IL

I was just going to remain silent and hope that the notes got more interesting before she discovered the whole world was reading them!

Gary

Date: 15 Feb 1994 18:55:11 GMT
From: gulfaero.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.Brown.EDU!
NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2jm7e6\$4dv@paperboy.ids.net>,
<1994Feb14.155226.20706@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <1994Feb14.182749.22940@cs.brown.edu>
Subject : Re: General call signs.

In article <1994Feb14.182749.22940@cs.brown.edu>, md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu
(Michael P. Deignan) wrote:

> For instance, if I ever upgraded to Extra, I doubt I would change
> my callsign; I've had this one for so long changing it would be
> like changing my name. (But then again, if I could get K1CW or
> K1DX.... :-))

Hell.. I want K1FU!!!!!!!!!!!!

Tony

--

== Anthony_Pelliccio@Brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR)
== Brown University Alumni & Development Computing Services
== Box 1908, Providence, RI 02912 Tel. (401) 863-1880
== I speak for myself, and not for Brown University. Remember that!

Date: Wed, 16 Feb 1994 14:21:48 GMT
From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!cscsun!dtiller@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <10@ted.win.net>, <ZcH0gc3w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
<CKrtyA.55t@news.Hawaii.Edu>irginia.
Subject : Re: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

Jeff Herman (jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:

: Oh my! Dan, don't get mad but I think you might not have built much
: gear. These QRP CW xmtrs I put together can take days to assemble -
: collecting the parts, repeated calculations with various L&C choices,
: winding the coils (heck - I've been looking for something I can use
: as a 1/2 inch coil form for 2 days now). I keep hving to run up to
: the library to check the transistor manual as I 'discover' various
: x-sistors in these old TV sets.
: A SSB rig would be a killer to build from scratch; also, it needs
: specialized parts that one cannot fabricate. FM? What's that?

If I may add MHO, an FM transmitter is nothing more than a CW transmitter
with a bad capacitor in the oscillator!! :-) Seriously, a PM (Phase
Modulated) transmitter is simple - add a microphone to the system. You
can use a piece of aluminum foil stretched across a hoop very close to
a groundplane as a voice actuated cap. The deviation will be perhaps,
how shall I say, non-standard, but it'll work.

--

David Tiller	Network Administrator	Voice: (804) 752-7373	
dtiller@rmc.edu	Randolph-Macon College	Fax: (804) 752-7231	
n2kau@wa4ong.va.usa.na	P.O. Box 5005	ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N	
+++Arch-Conservative+++	Ashland, Va 23005	77d 31' 32.19" W	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #68
